

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 10-32 are pending in the present application. Claims 8, 31, and 32 are currently amended. Claim 9 is canceled. Claims 12-13, 21, and 27-30 are withdrawn from further consideration. Reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

New matter is not being introduced into the Application by way of this amendment. The amendment to claims 8, 31 and 32 is supported, for example, at page 25 lines 18-19 of the Specification. The remaining amendment to claim 31 is editorial and does not change the scope of the claim.

Accordingly, since this amendment places the claims in a better condition for allowance, and directly responds to the Examiner's comments in the Office Action, entry of this amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112 (page 2 of the Office Action)

Claims 10, 11, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. The Examiner asserts that claim 31, from which claims 10 and 11 depend, recites the limitation "said one or more kinds of" with insufficient antecedent basis.

Claim 31 is currently amended to address this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102 (pages 2-3 of the Office Action)

Claims 8, 10, 11, 15-20, 22-26, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Willems '497 (U.S. Patent No. 6,194,497); Hilti '688 (U.S. Patent No. 5,814,688); Helms '015 (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,015); or Wada '554 (JP 01178554). For the following reasons, each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

Claims 8, 31 and 32 as currently amended recite a polymer composition that comprises "a polyether block polyolefin copolymer." It is respectfully suggested that this limitation is not disclosed or suggested by any of the cited prior art references.

Willems '497 mentions various polymers that can be used with their invention at col. 3, lines 5-8. However, Willems '497 does not mention polymers with a polyether block polyolefin copolymer. Willems '497 therefore does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of the present claims. It is respectfully suggested that this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Helms '015 discloses conductive polymeric materials, combined with an alkali metal salt. See Helms Abstract. However, Helms '015 does not disclose or suggest "a polyether block polyolefin copolymer" as recited in the present claims 8, 31 and 32. Helms '015 does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of the present claims. It is respectfully suggested that this rejection must also now be withdrawn.

Hilti '688 discloses a polar inorganic or organic material to which an anti-static agent is bound "adsorptively." Hilti '688, col. 8, lines 33-34. Hilti '688 does not disclose or suggest "a polyether block polyolefin copolymer" as recited in the present claims 8, 31 and 32. It is respectfully suggested that this rejection must now be withdrawn.

Wada '554 discloses compositions which include a thermoplastic resin with a polyether-ester-amide elastomer, and a fluoroalkyl metal salt. However, Wada '554 does not mention polymers with a polyether block polyolefin copolymer as recited in the present claims. It is respectfully suggested that this rejection should now be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103 (page 3 of the Office Action)

Claims 1-7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Willems '497, Helms '015, Hilti '688, or JP 01178554. For the following reasons, each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action concedes that these references do not explicitly disclose polyolefin block copolymers. However, the Examiner asserts that the Applicants have failed to demonstrate criticality of polyolefin/ether block copolymers. See Office Action, page 3, section 7.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present Application demonstrates that unexpected results are achieved by the addition of a polyether block polyolefin copolymer. The unexpected results are first described in the specification at page 25, line 16 to page 26, line 12. Examples 1 and 2 of the specification (which utilize polyether block polyolefin copolymers) show compositions that demonstrate surprising results over the compositions of comparative Examples 1 through 4 (which do not use polyether block polyolefin copolymers). See Specification, Table 1, page 77.

Comparative Example 5 shows a low electrical resistance, but has a high hardness due to the addition of excess antistatic agent. Thus, the compositions of Examples 1 and 4 also show surprising and unexpected results over comparative Example 5 as well.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the cited evidence well demonstrates the criticality of compositions which include a polyether block polyolefin copolymer. Since the prior art does not disclose or suggest and criticality has now been demonstrated, the Applicants respectfully assert that the claims are now presently allowable. An early reconsideration and Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

If any questions arise regarding the above matters, please contact Applicant's representative, J. Mark Konieczny (Reg. No. 47,715), in the Washington Metropolitan Area at the phone number listed below.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2448, under Order No. 2927-0166P from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



By  #42874

Andrew D. Meikle

Registration No.: 32,868

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

